



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"36. They cannot restore the blind man to his sight, nor deliver a man from distress.

"41. As though they could be sensible that have no motion themselves.

"44. But all things that are done about them are false; how is it, then, to be thought or to be said that they are gods?"

"54. When fire shall fall upon the house of these gods of wood, and of silver, and of gold, their priests, indeed, will flee away and be saved, but they themselves shall be burnt in the midst like beams.

"56, 57. They that are stronger than them [that is, robbers and thieves are stronger than these idols, being things without life or motion (Douay note)] shall take from them the gold and silver and the raiment wherewith they are clothed, and shall go their way, neither shall they help themselves.

"66. Neither do they show signs in the heaven to the nations, nor shine as the sun, nor give light as the moon.

"67. Beasts are better than they, which can fly under a covert and help themselves.

"68. Therefore, there is no manner of appearance that they are gods."

The vileness of these gods, then, consists in their "having no motion themselves," "their being secured under lock or bolt," "their being carried on shoulders," "their liability to be gnawed or eaten by creeping things," and "their inability to deliver themselves, their tabernacles, &c., from sacrilegious hands."

And the prophet's argument is as follows, viz., "Whoever is possessed of these characteristics of weakness, or to whatever such descriptions apply, cannot be God. The idols are so, therefore are not gods."

As this argument is contained in a book rejected by Protestants, but whose inspiration is earnestly contended for by the Church of Rome, Roman Catholics should be sensitively alive to its force and any legitimate inference based upon it.

Now, then, does not the host answer distinctly to the prophet's description of the idol? Is it not "without motion of itself," "secured under lock or clasp," "carried upon shoulders," "liable to be gnawed or eaten by creeping things," and "impotent to prevent spoliation of its temples, tabernacles, &c., &c., by the sacrilegious?"

If, therefore, we substitute the word "host" for "idol" in the mirror of the above syllogism, is not the prophet's argument conclusive against the doctrine of transubstantiation?

I would, therefore, request of Mr. Bourke to free his Church from the dilemma in which it appears herein to be involved.

If the Spirit of God indited this argument it must be conclusive, and is then equally valid against the divinity of the host as against the divinity of the idol. The Spirit of God must have foreseen that Deity (if the doctrine of transubstantiation be true) was about to be revealed to the world, as the most wonderful and necessary fact of Christianity, in the very form and character here commented on, "without motion, secured in a pix, carried on men's shoulders, gnawed and eaten by creeping things, impotent, &c." Could any one believe, then, that, upon such a supposition, He would have selected these very circumstances as sufficient, of themselves, to prove unquestionably that an idol could not be Deity, knowing that an event was about to take place which would completely falsify such a position, and justify the heathen in rejecting it as inconclusive. Rational men who acknowledged the argument convincing would, therefore, reject the claim of the idol; and, for the very same reason, would also feel under the necessity of rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation.

The fact of the host, as well as the idol, possessing those characteristics (which forms the minor premise of the syllogism) is open to every man's daily observation. The principle, that such characteristics disprove the possession of divinity (which is the major premise) is assumed as incontrovertible in the book of Baruch.

If, then, it be inspired by the Holy Ghost, the argument is valid, and transubstantiation falls to the ground.

But if, to avoid this horn of the dilemma, the universality of the principle expressed in the major premise be impugned—which seems the only way of escaping from such a fatal concession—then the validity of the argument is overthrown, and its failure in relation to the host renders it inconclusive as an argument in relation to the idol, and by consequence the inspiration of the book in which a sophism is relied on as sound argument cannot stand, nor the claim of the Church whose infallibility is committed to its assertion.

Yours, &c.,

RUSTICUS.

P.S.—Roman Catholics who prize this Book of Baruch as genuine Scripture would do well to compare this 6th chapter with the extract from the *Univers* given in your last number, page 115, and solemnly judge as before God whether such scenes are more in conformity with the admonitions of their own Bible than the conduct of Protestants, who refuse to "venerate, honour, glorify, pro-

* See the Rubric in the Missal, where such an event is supposed, and the duty of the priest on such occasions specified. The Prophet, v. 19, refers also to their insensibility when gnawed or eaten, in "not even feeling it." Nothing is defined with regard to the host in this particular.

trate themselves before" image or statue—before anything but God. Thus, with ominous mention of "Babylon," Jeremiah the prophet is here recorded to have said (verse 3, &c.)—"Now you shall see in Babylon gods of gold, and of silver, and of stone, and of wood, borne upon shoulders, causing fear to the Gentiles. Beware, therefore, that you imitate not the doings of others, and be afraid, and the fear of them should seize upon you. But when you see the multitude behind and before adoring them, say you in your hearts, Thou oughtest to be adored, O Lord." Verse 7, &c.—"For their tongue that is polished by the craftsman, and themselves laid over with gold and silver, are false things, and they cannot speak. And as if it were for a maiden that loveth to go gay, so do they take gold and make them up. Their gods have golden crowns upon their heads," &c. Verse 12.—"When they have covered them with a purple garment they wipe their face because of the dust of the house, which is very much among them." Verse 16.—"When they are placed in the house, their eyes are full of dust by the feet of them that go in." Verse 18.—"They light candles to them, and that in great number," &c. Verse 50.—"For seeing they are but of wood and laid over with gold and silver, it shall be known hereafter that they are false things," &c., "and that there is no work of God in them." Verse 72.—"Better, therefore, is the just man that hath no idols, for he shall be far from reproach."

THE POPE AT JERUSALEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—With reference to your arguments regarding Rome not being the See of St. Peter and his alleged successors, allow me to bring to your notice, and if you think proper to that of your Roman Catholic readers and correspondents, a work written by L'Abbé Michon, entitled "La Papauté à Jérusalem." The author, after stating that the future temporal state of Rome is now a question of the greatest interest to the human mind, and expressing his sense of the delicacy of the subject upon which he is about to enter, says, that such are his feelings of filial devotion to the Church, and him who is visibly its pastor and father, that he is confident of not incurring the slightest suspicion of disrespect to an authority which is the object of his profound veneration.

In stating the fact, the Abbé gives proof that Rome has fallen to a degradation so much below the worst governed European powers as no longer to be recognised in the position which she once held in the family or federalism of nations. He wishes to see its ruler relieved from the embarrassment in which he is now involved by priestly misgovernment, and urges what he asserts to be a cherished idea of Pius IX., that the Pope should flee from the misery and wretchedness of his oppressed subjects, and escape to Jerusalem; there to unite under one head Popery and Mahomedism, and to frame a system which shall embrace the [idolatry?] of the Greek Church and [the heresies of] every other [fallen] Christianity-professing community of the east, the Abbé may, perhaps, hope to realise the Romish interpretation of the prophecies contained in the iii. chapter of Isaiah and the iv. of Micah.

Our author says that he approaches the subject with less difficulty, inasmuch as it is not he who has raised the question which has now such actuality and attraction in the religious and political world; that is one which, under his pen, is but a study of matters free to all, in which he, like every other writer, has a legitimate right of discussion, and which others might approach with less gentle respect and deference.

The Abbé unhesitatingly admits that by the XXII. Protocol of the late Conference at Paris the temporal power of the Papacy is placed in the most serious crisis through which it has ever had to pass; and that, affected by the working of the interests and aspirations of modern civilisation, it has been called upon either to largely modify its hierarchical constitution or to disappear from the great political family of Europe. It must be acknowledged, says our author, that no shock has been so severe as this; the treaties of 1815 had maintained the Papacy as an integral part of restored Europe, but the conservative diplomatists of 1856 declare the situation of the Pontifical states to be an abnormal situation, and their government a danger for the internal peace of Europe. Let me ask, is this what is to be expected from the preaching and progress of the Gospel, and from the conduct of men who profess to be the ministering servants of our Lord Jesus Christ? Is it the fruits of the godliness which the Apostle tells us "the promise of the life that now is as well as of that which is to come?"—1 Timothy, iv. 8.

Yet this is the state to which the Church of Rome, with its infallibility and asserted possession of the keys of Heaven, has reduced one of the formerly foremost races of mankind, and what was once one of the fairest portions of the globe! Is there not in the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th verses of the xvii. chap. of the Apocalypse something very like a description of the crisis in which the Abbé Michon affirms that Rome is now placed?

Let me entreat our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects to look around upon the world, and fairly consider whether Rome and those countries which are most under her influence—Austria, Spain, and Naples—are not the most tyrannically and worst governed upon earth? Let me beg of them to judge dispassionately the condition of those populations which are most under priestly autho-

riety and the influence of concordats, as compared with their own in this kingdom, and in countries in which the power of Rome is least felt. Let me ask them to discern fairly whether the increasing prosperity of Ireland and decreasing power of the Roman Catholic priesthood are not correlative in their progress.

The Abbé Michon has to encounter the difficulty that arises from the dogmas of his Church, and that too much has been maintained in endeavouring to establish the episcopacy of St. Peter at Rome and the continuity of his see. There appears to be a wide difference, if not a diametrical opposition, between the arguments of the Abbé and the authoritative assertions of Dr. Wiseman, the Romish Cardinal, which were published in the last number of the LAYMAN. How the members of a Church which claims infallibility and proclaims unity are to reconcile such differences must be determined by themselves; but in this opposition of priests' opinions it may be observed, as the Abbé asserts, that a majority of their theologians, and the present Pope, are on his side. Let us hear, however, what the Abbé says, and ponder those passages which I mark in italics. Let those most interested in such a question ascertain who constituted the Church, which, according to our author, should have elected the first successor to Saint Peter. They most clearly could not have been the cardinals of Rome, for the Abbé elsewhere traces the rise of that government from its beginning among the other powers of modern Europe.

"Can the Pope transfer the apostolic seat to any place in the world? The majority of theologians pronounce for the affirmative. They maintain that the sovereign pontiff has all liberty to establish himself where he pleases. According to them, Jesus Christ has given the primacy to Peter, but has not made him Bishop of Rome. Wherever he may be, the Pope preserves his primacy. Bellarmine, whose authority is not suspicious, says, 'The Bishop of Rome is the successor of Peter only by the deed of Peter, and not by the first institution of Jesus Christ; for Peter might not have chosen any particular seat as he did during the first five years, and, in this case, at his death, neither the Bishop of Rome nor that of Antioch would have succeeded him, but he whom the Church should have chosen.'

"He might have remained at Antioch, and then the Bishop of Antioch would have succeeded him; but having fixed his seat at Rome, and having died there, the Bishop of Rome succeeds him. The Papacy is, then, inherent to the succession of Peter, no matter in what town the seat is. And when Pius VI., dying at Valence, expressed regret at finishing his days in exile, the cardinal who assisted was right in saying, 'Holy Father, the Pope is everywhere in his country.' Many Catholics little versed in these matters believe that the Papacy is attached to the seat of Rome. The dignity of chief of the Church, and the abode of Rome, seem to them inseparable. For them to make the Pope leave Rome is to destroy the Papacy. It suffices for the abandonment of this opinion to reflect that, in fact, the Papacy has already had its successive migrations. We have advanced, that if the determination of a change of seat were taken by the Papacy, there would be no town in the world where it would have more independence and a grander future than at Jerusalem. Then, the Papacy, protected by all the Christian powers, finds itself in a situation independent of them, in a neuter country, and independent of the sovereign of that country by a high guarantee from those same powers whose great religious interests she governs. Here is a new situation for the sovereign pontiff towards the Catholic world. It has the immense advantages of no longer giving him the fatiguing cares of a temporal domain, and of leaving him exclusively to his great apostolic mission."

Now, bear in mind that the Abbé Michon is obliged argumentatively to admit that neither France nor any other Papal country will afford a fitting asylum for the Pope if he should be driven from Rome, but that all Papists must subscribe their money to maintain him in magnificence at Jerusalem. Roman Catholic friends and brethren, is it consistent with the dignity and reverence due to God's vicegerent upon earth, if there were such a person, that he should be obliged to flee from the consequences of his own and his predecessors' misrule, to live in a state of eleemosynary dependence, and meretricious splendour, as is proposed by a devoted son of your Church? If the view propounded by the Abbé Michon, and encouraged by large numbers of your co-religionists on the Continent, should be realised, and in the Pope's next flight if Gaeta should only be the port of his embarkation for Jerusalem, there to attempt all that the Abbé has suggested, would such an event be most in accordance with the 3rd or with the 15th verse of the xxiv. chap. of St. Matthew's gospel? A.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR NOVEMBER.

Young and store stock should be housed or kept in dry sheltered yards, supplying them liberally with roots, fresh straw, and hay.

Ploughing.—All stubble lands should be well and deeply ploughed during the month. Lea lands intended for green crops should also be ploughed up, to allow time for the sods to rot before cross-ploughing in the spring.